



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the lessons; otherwise the preparation of the lessons would be a blind and discouraging exercise for the inexperienced pupil. On the other hand, in the preparation of many of the lessons, the student is obliged to use constantly a dictionary, and even then cannot in every case find a clue to certain details of idiom, or sometimes to the structure of an entire sentence. For such cases, helpful suggestions should have been put either in foot-notes, or in the vocabulary.

As to pronunciation, I entirely agree with Prof. van Daell in what he says in the Preface. There are many typographical errors in this first edition, a few places where the English wording may be slightly improved, and a *lapsus calami* in two or three places in the grammar; these will be corrected in the revised edition which, I understand, will appear shortly and, therefore, I do not think it necessary to call special attention to them in these columns. Formerly we used Chardenal's 'French Course' for Freshmen French at Harvard. What did I gain by changing to the work under discussion? In the first place, the men in this year's course received a stronger discipline in the study of French Grammar from the beginning; in the second place, we shall have read, by May 30, from one thousand three hundred to one thousand four hundred pages of French, whilst during the academic year 1892-93 we read from five hundred to six hundred and fifty pages only; this result I attribute, in a measure, to Prof. van Daell's excellent and helpful book.

THÉODORE HENCKELS.

Harvard University.

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR.

Précis de Grammaire Comparée de l'Anglais et de l'Allemand rapportés à leur commune origine et rapprochés des langues classiques, par VICTOR HENRY. Paris: Hachette et Cie, 1893. 8vo, pp. xix, 418.

VICTOR HENRY'S new publication, a comparative grammar of the English and German languages, is in every respect an exact counterpart of his well-known 'Précis de Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin,' which has proved its *raison d'être* by its appearance in a

fourth edition (1892). Even the prefaces of the two books exhibit a strong similarity of views, showing that the author's experiences have corroborated the soundness of his plan. All modern language teachers that are striving to raise their vocation above the plane of dilettanteism and mere *Sprachmeisterei* will gladly endorse what he says about the purpose of his book:

"Le moment est venu d'essayer, dans l'enseignement supérieur des langues vivantes, la direction historique et scientifique qui a quelque peu rajeuni l'agrégation des classes de grammaire, de mettre nos futurs professeurs en mesure de suivre, s'il leur en prend goût, le grand mouvement linguistique qui comptera un jour parmi les plus méritoires efforts de ce siècle, ou, plus simplement, d'offrir à ceux qui connaissent à la fois l'anglais et l'allemand les éléments d'une méthode comparative, etc."

But I fear his enthusiasm is carrying him too far in hoping

"Que ceux qui l'auront sérieusement étudiée y pourront trouver aussi les rudiments des anciens idiomes et s'en servir pour traduire, sans autre étude préalable et sans autre secours que celui d'un simple lexique approprié, quelques textes faciles de moyen-anglais ou de moyen-allemand, de vieux-haut-allemand ou d'anglo-saxon, voire de gotique ou de bas-allemand."

The opposite way would certainly lead to more satisfactory results and would facilitate the ready comprehension of the trend of philological argumentation. A knowledge of the classical languages may to some extent take the place of a special study of the oldest Germanic dialects, but an acquaintance with the elements of Gothic is the lowest requirement for students that enter on the historical study of English or German, even if provided with such an excellent guide as Prof. Henry's book. Aside from this objection, which experience with the 'Précis' may decide, such a course is advisable from the standpoint of pedagogical economy: the student will save much time and mental labor by first acquainting himself with the forms, at least, of the older dialects. The encouragement given to students whose preparation ought hardly to suggest to them the existence of a science of language, and the assurance "qu'on peut s'y orienter sans avoir appris ni le sanscrit ni le grec ni même le latin"

look more like a concession to the actual deplorable conditions of the preparation of language teachers than an expression of the author's personal opinion.

The book is a marvel of clear presentation of a difficult and often intricate subject, a result reached, no doubt, by the omission of controversies in many cases—a lack fully compensated, however, by a wise choice of consistent theories—but chiefly due to the rare gift of a well-blended combination of scholarship and technical skill. A few points call for suggestions and corrections. P. xviii, note 1: The remark on the signs > and < shows that Schuchardt's uncalled-for discussion is bearing bad fruit. Henry never uses this convenient and plain sign.—P. 12. "Le groupe central comprend le saxon, le thuringien, le haut et le moyen franconien." The term "saxon" ought to be modified to avoid ambiguity: haut saxon, Upper Saxon, Obersächsisch; cf. p. 113, note 2.—P. 35: The vowels in *bolt* and *bolz* are not identical; the former has *ō*, the latter *ǫ*.—P. 39: *foot*: *fusz*=*brood*: *brut* is no correct equation, even with the restrictive "à peu près"; *monday* and *montag*, too, differ too much to call the *o*'s identical.—P. 44: the pronunciation *glās* (<*glā-ses*) should be limited to the South.—P. 55: Why not represent the indistinct vowel by *ə* instead of *ä*, which may be confusing to the beginner? *ə* is, moreover, not always=European *a*; cf. P. B. B., 16, 235.—P. 58: **wiraz*>Goth. *wair-s* (sic!); cf. the same mistake on p. 63, ii, *sair-s*! which noun is, moreover, neuter.—P. 99: "*gū*, suivant la voyelle qu'il précédait s'est réduit postérieurement à une simple articulation, soit *g*, soit *w*, etc." Why not state the law?—P. 112: **dhogh-ō-s*>*ðagā-s*. Why the accent on the ultima in Gen. Teutonic?—P. 148: "*rāj-as*, le corrélatif rigoureux est Got. *riq-is*"(?) We have to suppose contamination with the *-o* stems to save the sound laws; cf. *mīns*<**minuiz*; **gastiz*>*gasts*; *peihs*, *ahs*, etc., etc.—The treatment of the *-n*-stems on pp. 141 f. might have been more detailed to make the rather involved conditions conform to a stricter application of phonetical rules.—P. 190: *kürzlich* is now also used as an adjective; other similar forms are beginning to encroach upon forbidden territory.—Composition of nouns in

German is dangerous ground for a foreigner; idiomatic usage has settled many cases that defy regularity: *Rindsleder*, *Rinderbraten*, *Kalbleder*, *Kalbsleber*. *Kalbsfleisch* might do, but *Rindsfleisch* is hardly used (cf. the proper name *Rindfleisch*) p. 204.—P. 197: *Ellbogen* corresponds exactly to ags. *el-boga*.—P. 210: *nīun*; a reference to p. 75, note 3 (*sibun*) has been omitted.—P. 219. The vocative does not call for a special treatment either in O.H.G. or in O.E., yet the statement that the vocative has been merged in the nominative in "Germanic needs an important restriction.—P. 243: *herzog* has unlauted plural; the same mistake on p. 244, 5 and 248, 2.—P. 245: *naups* keeps the surd in the plural (as well as in other cases).—P. 255, note 1: *Chor* is now used as a masculine to distinguish it from *Corps*, n. *Rohr* better without unlaut, cf. *Röhre* f.—P. 258: *bauer* and *nachbar* share the same peculiarities.—P. 259: The Gen. Teut. gen. of **wulfaz* cannot be **wulfiza*, cf. §150, i, 1, c.—P. 264, note 3: *Herzen* is the regular sg. dat. and not only used in the phrase *von Herzen*.—P. 310: A mention of the rule about the preservation of the pret. indic. plur. vowel in the subj. would have led to the omission of such forms as *stärbe*, *wärfe*; *scholt* is archaic, like *golt*; *drosch* is preferred to *drasch*.—P. 312: *bare*, pret. of *bear*, is archaic.—P. 341: *dresche* as imperative sg. is as incorrect as *esse* for *isz*.

The book has so many excellencies that the above criticisms will not detract from its value. It deserves a translation into English to reach a wider circle of students, and is heartily recommended to all instructors in English, and also in German, who wish to get for their linguistic studies a thorough basis not yet provided for in such a desirable form in any other book. Copious references would greatly enhance its value.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Chicago.

FRENCH GRAMMAR.

College Preparatory French Grammar, by CHAS. P. DE CROQUET. 8vo, pp. 384. New York: William R. Jenkins. Boston: C. Schoenhof.